



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/015,613	12/17/2001	Patrick Baudisch	132954	5897
65575 7590 05/15/2009 OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC P.O. BOX 320850 ALEXANDRIA, VA 22320-4850				
EXAMINER				
RICHER, AARON M				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2628				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
05/15/2009		PAPER		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

# Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/015,613

**Applicant(s)**

BAUDISCH, PATRICK

**Examiner**

AARON M. RICHER

**Art Unit**

2628

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 February 2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SE/US)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Response to Arguments***

1. Applicant's arguments filed February 25, 2009 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.
2. As to claims 1, 11, and 22, applicant argues that Odryna does not disclose displaying a substantially continuous image on adjacent monitors, instead disclosing a non-contiguous image, such as different kinds of financial information, on adjacent monitors. Examiner notes that this non-contiguous case is one thing the Odryna invention would be capable of, but it is not the only thing. One skilled in the art would recognize that the contiguousness of what is being displayed on the adjacent monitors would depend on what was in the oversize display buffer described at col. 6, lines 41-50. If non-contiguous data were in the buffer, then non-contiguous data would be displayed on the adjacent monitors. If contiguous data were in the buffer, then contiguous data would be displayed on the adjacent monitors. Since one skilled in the art would know that both non-contiguous and contiguous data could be fed to the buffer, this is not further explained in the Detailed Description of Odryna, although it is noted by examiner that contiguous portions of the input signal being split into plural video output signals is mentioned in the claims of Odryna (see claim 74 at col. 31, lines 58-60).
3. Applicant further argues that Odryna does not disclose using two monitors with different display resolutions. Odryna, however, clearly states the hub used in the invention drives displays of differing resolutions (col. 2, lines 10-26; in particular, see col. 2, lines 18-19).

4. Applicant's arguments with respect to the new limitations of claims 1, 11, and 22 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1-5, 7, 11-13, 16-18, and 21-25 are rejected under are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Trueblood (U.S. Patent 5,748,189) in view of Odryna (U.S. Patent 6,333,750) and further in view of Callway (U.S. Patent 6,424,320).

7. As to claims 1, 11, and 22, Trueblood discloses a display comprising:

at least two display devices (fig. 5, elements 62 and 64), each display device having a display area with a given display resolution wherein the display resolution of at least one display area is different from the display resolution of at least one other display area (col. 8, lines 5-11; displays with different resolutions are disclosed), a boundary wherein the boundary of each display area is at least partially contiguous with the boundary of at least one other display area (fig. 4; col. 6, lines 53-66; the screens are shown being contiguous with each other), and an associated image processor for providing image information data (fig. 5; elements 66 and 68; col. 7, line 66-col. 8, line 11; each screen has its own image processor), and the displayed resolution of the portion of the image displayed on one of the at least two display areas is different than the displayed resolution of the portion of the image displayed on at least one other of

the at least two display areas (col. 8, lines 5-11; the displays and graphics cards use different resolutions);

Trueblood discloses an air traffic control display (col. 1, lines 29-44), suggesting that the airspace would appear substantially continuous if the coordinates are mapped the way they are shown in fig. 4, but does not explicitly disclose that the airspace is mapped continuously. Trueblood therefore fails to disclose the display devices being so constructed and arranged such that when a single image is displayed across the at least two display areas using image information data received from the associate image processors, the resulting displayed image is perceived as substantially continuous to a viewer situated to view the image, and also an image replicator configured to generate at least two different scale factors to scale the image information data displayed on corresponding ones of the at least two display devices, wherein the image information data is scaled by the at least two different scale factors for display on corresponding ones of the at least two display devices .

Odryna, however, discloses, a number of substantially contiguous display devices (see fig. 2 and 3) that display a continuous image (col. 6, lines 22-40; note that in addition to the non-contiguous portions in fig. 1a, continuous portions are displayed in fig. 1b-1c). In addition, Odryna discloses a scaler to scale the data for an appropriate resolution for each display device (col. 20, line 52-col. 21, line 5). It is also noted that Odryna discloses that the display devices may have different resolutions (col. 2, lines 10-26). The motivation for this is that contiguous monitors showing a continuous image allow a less costly display than having one large monitor showing it (col. 1, lines 29-40).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to modify Trueblood to display a continuous image and scale appropriately for each display in order to allow a less costly display as taught by Odryna.

Neither Trueblood nor Odryna discloses displaying such that one of scaling, brightness, color and translation of display first and second image data are both within a predetermined tolerance value. Callway, however, discloses a multi-monitor system in which calibration of the color component signals to the same value (i.e. tolerance = 0) occurs (col. 7, lines 7-40). The motivation for this is that otherwise the displays will look noticeably different (col. 2, lines 36-45). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to modify Trueblood and Odryna to calibrate color signals in order to match displays as taught by Callway.

8. As to claims 2, 3, 12, 13, 23, and 24, Trueblood does not disclose using an LCD display or a projector/projection surface. However, official notice has been taken of the fact that these display devices are very well-known in the art (see MPEP 2144.03). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to modify Trueblood to utilize an LCD display or projector/projection surface in order to increase compatibility with modern display systems.

9. As to claim 4, Trueblood discloses a display wherein first and second boundaries are at least partially contiguous (fig. 4; col. 6, lines 53-66; the screens are shown being contiguous with each other).

10. As to claims 5 and 25, Trueblood discloses a display wherein one display area is adjacent to another display area (fig. 4; col. 6, lines 53-66; the screens are shown being adjacent to each other)
11. As to claim 7, Trueblood discloses a third display device (fig. 4) having a third display area with third display resolution, wherein the third display resolution is different from at least one of the first display resolution and the second display resolution (col. 8, lines 5-11; col. 11, lines 42-56; a third display with different resolution is disclosed), and a third boundary (fig. 4).
12. As to claim 16, Trueblood discloses a display wherein there are two display areas (fig. 5).
13. As to claim 17, Trueblood discloses a display wherein there are 3 display areas, a first display area, a second display area, and a third display area (fig. 4; col. 11, lines 42-56)
14. As to claim 18, Trueblood discloses a display wherein there are 5 display areas (fig. 4).
15. As to claim 21, Trueblood discloses second and third display areas spaced apart with a portion of the first display area interposed therebetween (fig. 4; if it is assumed that screen 3 is the first display, screen 1 is the second display, and screen 4 is the third display, then a portion of the first display- screen 3 is in between the second- screen 1 and the third- screen 4).

16. Claims 6, 8-10, 14, 15, 19, 20, 26, and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Trueblood in view of Odryna and Callway and further in view of Gennetten (U.S. Patent 6,812,907).

17. As to claims 6, 14, 26, and 27, neither Trueblood nor Odryna discloses a display that surrounds another display. Gennetten, however, discloses a display wherein the first display area is surrounded by the second display area (figs. 2 and 3). Gennetten also discloses two separate display devices (col. 9, lines 16-29) that are contiguous (figs. 2, 3, 4, and 5), such that a single image is continuous across the two display areas (col. 2, lines 21-33; large images are displayed across both displays continuously). The motivation for this arrangement is to enable detailed view of an image without unnecessarily wasting power, since a surrounding screen can be turned off (col. 1, line 61-col. 2, line 19). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to modify Trueblood, Odryna, and Callway to display an image continuously over one device that surrounds another in order to enable detailed view of that image, but also save power as taught by Gennetten.

18. As to claims 8, 10, 15, and 19, Trueblood discloses at least 3 display areas as in fig. 4. Gennetten further discloses a display wherein the first display area fully surrounds the second display area as described in the rejection to claim 6. The teachings of Gennetten can be equivalently applied to a three display system, creating a three display system in which two displays are surrounded by another display, and in which a display is surrounded by a display which is surrounded by another display. Motivation for this combination can be found in the rejection to claim 6.



19. As to claim 9, Trueblood discloses second and third display areas spaced apart with a portion of the first display area interposed therebetween (fig. 4; if it is assumed that screen 3 is the first display, screen 1 is the second display, and screen 4 is the third display, then a portion of the first display- screen 3 is in between the second- screen 1 and the third- screen 4).

20. As to claim 20, Trueblood discloses at least 3 display areas, wherein two are spaced apart, as in fig. 4, and in the rejection to claim 9 above. Gennetten further discloses a display wherein the first display area fully surrounds the second display area as described in the rejection to claim 6. The teachings of Gennetten can be equivalently applied to a three display system, creating a three display system in which two surrounded display areas are spaced apart. Motivation for this combination can be found in the rejection to claim 6.

### ***Conclusion***

21. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to AARON M. RICHER whose telephone number is (571)272-7790. The examiner can normally be reached on weekdays from 8:30AM-5:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kee Tung can be reached on (571) 272-7794. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.